

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/721,550	REICH, NORBERT	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BJ Forman	1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Claude Nassif. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11 December 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed amendments!.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner discussed the amendments proposed by Mr. Nassif via FAX and stated that while a search of the prior art had not been performed, the method claims read on a sandwich assay wherein one probe is labeled with a FRET label, the target is unlabeled and a second target-specific probe is labeled with a quenching label such that hybridization between the first probe, target and second probe the signal was decreased and/or quenched. The examiner suggested that the claims more clearly define the invention e.g. a single probe. The examiner also stated that the product claims need further definition because the functional language describing the interaction between the probe and target does not limit the probe. Therefore, the instant product claim reads on a support having labeled probes. Mr. Nassif stated that he would consult with the inventors and then provide further amendments. .